UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,467	11/17/2006	Philippe Espiard	279791US0PCT	8944
22850 7590 09/22/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			PEPITONE, MICHAEL F	
ALEAANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2008	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/553,467	ESPIARD ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MICHAEL PEPITONE	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Oc	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 7 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) 4-23 is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)⊠ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/3/06.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/553,467 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

## Claim Objections

Claims 4-5 and 8-23 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only--, and/or, --cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claims 6-7 are objected to because of the following informalities: Alternative expressions are permitted if they present no uncertainty or ambiguity with respect to the question of scope or clarity of the claims. One acceptable form of alternative expression, which is commonly referred to as a Markush group, recites members as being "selected from the group consisting of A, B and C." See Ex parte Markush, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925) [See MPEP 2173.05(h)]. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Application/Control Number: 10/553,467

Art Unit: 1796

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Page 3

Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 2 recites the broad recitation a functionality less than 5000, and the claim also recites a functionality less than 2000 or even less than 500 which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

In the present instance, claim 3 recites the broad recitation molecular mass ranging from 50 to  $10^5$  g/mol, and the claim also recites less than  $10^4$  g/mol which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,467 Page 4

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nigam (6,171,444).

Regarding claim 1: Nigam teaches a sizing composition (2:65-3:2; 7:42-64; 11:35-40) comprising a polycarboxylic acid (8:4-31; 8:54-67) and polyamine (8:32-53; 9:1-10).

Regarding claims 2-3: Nigam teaches polycarboxylic acids having a functionality of 3 {greater than 2 and less than 5000} [instant claim 2] (8:22-30; 8:54-67), specifically 1,2,4,5-benzene tetracarboxylic acid (mw = 254.15 g/mol) [instant claim 3] (8:27-28).

Regarding claims 6-7: Nigam teaches poly(acrylic acid) [instant claims 6-7] (8:57).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,467 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PEPITONE whose telephone number is (571)270-

3299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

15-Sep-08

**MFP** 

11-September-08